Delaware Department of Transportation

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

T200911302 (1B)

US 301 & SR 1 Interchange

Saturday, February 06, 2016

Q #	Question	Answer
4	1. Structures RW1-3 and RW1-3R do not show any type of drainage system behind MSE walls. Is this typical for DELDOT or should there be a drain system with weepholes? 2. Please provide as-built drawings for interfering structures for bridge 1-432. Temporary sheeting (SOE) is called out on sheet 153 for existing Wingwalls on the West side of 1-432 and we have no information on what we are supporting? Additionally the cross sections do not show any existing structures or gas lines.	1. MSE wall drainage systems with weepholes are not required for this project. 2. Construction drawings for Bridge No. 1-903 from Contract No. 92-110-07 have been posted For Information Only to : http://www.deldot.gov/information/projects/us301/us301Archive/ContractorInfo/index.shtml
	3. Is any demolition required for the existing structures? Nothing is indicated in 1-432 plans unlike the plans for 1-903S which shows this scope of work. 4. Is SOE required on the east side of the bridge to support US-13? We have no information stating otherwise. Is SOE needed for the gas line removal? 5. Please provide a cross section showing the depth of the existing 10” steel gas line that needs to be removed? Note 7 on sheet 156 indicates the depth of a 16” steel gas line but nothing for the 10”. 6. The plan view (sheet 153) indicates the two gas lines are to be removed by others and portions in this contract, notes 6 & 7 on sheet 156 state that this work is done in this contract. Please clarify. 7. On page 127 & 128 of the Proposal; the Method of Measurement and the Basis of Payment for 602616 – Waterproofing PCCC Masonry Surfaces seem to be in conflict; please clarify payment for this item of work	3. Demolition of portions of Bridge No. 1-903N is not required. 4. Temporary support of excavation on the east side of Bridge No. 1-432 is not anticipated. Temporary support of excavation is anticipated for the removal of portions of the existing 10-inch gas line due to depth below the existing ground surface. See responses to questions 5 and 6 below. 5. Based on nearby test hole information, the existing 10-inch gas line is anticipated to be approximately 10 feet below the existing ground surface in the areas of the Bridge No. 1-432 abutments. 6. The plan notes on Sheet 153 indicate that the existing 16-inch and 10-inch gas lines will be relocated, abandoned and purged by others. The existing 16-inch line shall remain in place. The existing 10-inch line shall remain in place except for the portions designated for removal by the DelDOT Contractor in Contract T200911302, as specified on Sheet 156 Note 6 and Sheet 103 (Dwg, No. DT-20) Note 1. The Utility Statement also notes that the two ESNG gas lines are being purged and abandoned in place by ESNG. 7. Agreed. The Basis of Payment will be revised to indicate that the waterproofing membrane is incidental to Item 602015.

Q #	Question	Answer
4	8. Under Special Provision 602772 – Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls it indicates on page 129 of the Proposal that the "design of the internal stability of the MSE wall shall be the responsibility of the wall manufacturer. Determining the minimum length of reinforcing elements, as set forth herein, shall be the responsibility of the Contractor." On page 130 under Length of Reinforcing Elements it indicates that "the minimum reinforcement length shall be as shown on the plans and not less than 8'. In addition the length of the reinforcing elements shall be sufficient to satisfy all design criteria with respect internal and external stability." Please clarify these requirements; in the past the Wall Manufacturer was responsible for internal stability and the Owners/Designers took care of allowable bearing capacities and external stability parameters., please clarify your intent. 9. On page 280 of the Proposal it indicates that for Scheduling Software that Primavera Planner version 7.0 or latest is required; there are 12 computers required for this project. Is it the intent to have Primavera scheduling software on all 12 computers; software is very expensive. Please advise. 10. On page iii of the Proposal under the Prequalification requirement it indicates that if a Contractor has previously submitted Prequalification to DelDOT for other US 301 contracts and that information was accepted, then the Contractor does not need to resubmit for this contract. If this is the case and the Contractors name is on the list of US 301 Prequalified Firms; does the Prime Contractor have to submit by 10 AM on day of bid and/or include with his Bid	8. The minimum reinforcement lengths provided on the Plans are the minimum lengths required to satisfy the external stability of the MSE wall. The wall manufacturer is responsible for designing the reinforcement to meet the requirements for satisfying internal stability; however, the proposed reinforcement length must be equal to or greater than the minimum reinforcement lengths provided on the Plans. 9. Only one computer is required to have Scheduling Software Primavera Planner version 7.0 or latest. 10. No.
3	Construction Detail Sheet DT-16 and Sheet SW-04 both indicate that the structures shown will be paid under Item 272000 Pond Outlet Structure, Concrete No. 1. The Revised item number for this Contract item is 910006 which does not appear in the bid items, if these are both to be paid under Revised item 910007, than what is the Contract item 708512 for Manhole, Special I used for?	The structure on SW-04 designated as 272000 Pond Outlet Structure, Concrete No. 1 shall be paid as item 910007. Contract Item 708512 for Drainage Inlet, Special I, detailed on DT-19, shall pay for Inlet I-419 Contract Item 708513 for Drainage Inlet, Special II, detailed on DT-19, shall pay for Inlet I-427 Contract Item 708582 for Manhole, Special I, detailed on DT-16, shall pay for MH-414.

Q #	Question	Answer
	Friday, January 29, 2016	
2	Portions of MSE wall RW1-3R have a 2:1 backslope of the backfill behind the wall. The wall height in these areas range from approx 7 ft up to a max. height of approx 40 ft. Based on the AASHTO Fig. 3.4.1-2, this project is located in a Seismic zone with a Peak Horizontal Acceleration = .06g. We are assuming a Site Class "D" per AASHTO to determine the maximum wall acceleration. Preliminary MSE Wall designs assuming the above seismic conditions and using the Mononabe-Okabe method per the required AASHTO LRFD 7th Edition, indicate that the current wall geometry and grading configuration behind the walls would create an unstable situation. There is no indication of seismic loading requirements in the contract plans. 1. Are these design assumptions for seismic loading correct? 2. Were Seismic forces considered for the Department's evaluation of global stability? 3. Was the Mononabe-Okabe method used to determine the external stability of these MSE Walls?	1. Site Class D was used for bridge design on this project. 2. No, seismic analysis of retaining walls is not a design requirement for this project. 3. No.
1	1. Top of MSE Wall elevations for RW1-3 on Sheets 302 thru 305 are not shown. Please provide. 2. Top of MSE Wall elevations on RW1-3R on Sheets 333 thru 335 are not shown. Please provide. 3. Top of MSE Wall elevations on MSE Wall at Abutment A on Sheet 215 are not shown. Please provide.	The top of MSE wall elevations in these areas shall be determined by the Contractor based on the elevations of the moment slabs on top of the walls. This information can be derived from the road construction plans, profiles and typical sections and the details on Sheets 288 & 289, 306 thru 313, and 336 thru 351. Some elevations on the top of the moment slabs at the flowline/face of the parapet are shown on the plan sheets that show the Moment Slab Plan Views.

Q #	Question	Answer
*	**The below Questions and Answers were submitted on previous RT301 contracts and apply to this contract.**	
C	1. Does the prime contractor need to submit all of his subcontractors at the time of bid? 2. Does the prime contractor need to submit craft training certification for all of his subcontractors to be prequalified? 3. How can a prime contractor add subcontractors after the award if their craft training certification was not submitted at the time of the pre-qualification? 4. What happens if a prequalified prime contractor fails to maintain a craft training program for the life of the contract?	1.No, the prime contractor and subcontractors need to submit the "Prequalification for US 301 Contracts" form and provide supporting program documentation no later than 10 a.m. local time on the date of bid opening for prequalification. 2. Yes, the prime contractor and subcontractors need to submit the "Prequalification for US 301 Contracts" form and provide supporting program documentation no later than 10 a.m. local time on the date of bid opening for prequalification. 3. We will consider the addition of subcontractors after award of the Contract. Any subcontractors added will be subject to the same prequalification requirement for craft training in order to be approved for use on the Contract. 4. Enforcement of the craft training program will be the responsibility of the Delaware DOL.
B	Are we to submit all subcontractors that are under consideration, as the final decision on who we will be using will not have been made by that time?	To comply with 29 Del C. 6962(c)(11), all contractors and subcontractors with apprenticeable trades are required to have a craft training program and must be prequalified to bid on the US 301 projects.
A	Will you be publishing the list of signed in attendees to the US 301 Contractor Information Meeting held on August 24?	For questions and answers regarding unofficial information presented at the Contractor Information Meeting, please refer to the US301 Project Web site: http://www.deldot.gov/information/projects/us301/us301Archive/ContractorInfo/index.shtml